



special  
collections  
**DOUGLAS**  
**LIBRARY**



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





THE  
Bishop of Salisbury's  
Proper DEFENCE,  
FROM A  
S P E E C H  
Cry'd about the Streets in his Name,  
AND  
Said to have been Spoken by him in the House of  
Lords, upon the  
B I L L  
Against  
*OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY.*

---

---

Sold by the Booksellers of *London* and  
*Westminster*. 1704.

489, 1709. 66. 6

*The Bishop of Salisbury's Proper Defence,  
from a Speech Cry'd about the Streets in his  
Name, and said to have been Spoken by him  
in the House of Lords, upon the Bill against  
Occasional Conformity.*

**T**H E Licence of this Age, and of the Press is so great, that no Rank or Quality of Men is free from the *Insults* of Loose and Extravagant *Wits*.

The good *Bishop of Salisbury* has had a Plentiful Share in this sort of Treatment. And now at last, some or other has Presum'd to *Burlesque* his *Lordship*, in *Printing* a *Speech* for him, which none that knows his *Lordship* can believe ever came from him.

But because it may go down with others, who are too Apt to take *Slander* upon *Trust*; And that his *Lordship* has already been *Pelted* with several *Answers* to his *Speech*, I have Presum'd to offer the following Considerations, to Clear his *Lordship* from the Suspicion of having vented ( in such an *August Assembly*) those *Crude* and *Undigested* Matter, which are set forth in that *Speech*; and which so Highly *Reflects* upon his *Lordship's* self!

1. The first Reason given for *Rejecting* the *Bill* against *Occasional Conformity*, at this time, is for Preserving of *Unity* among our selves.

Was then the *Rejecting* a *Bill* which had been Carry'd on, with so much *Zeal* in the *House of Commons*, and *Voted* there in two *Sessions* Successively, by a great *Majority*, more than had usually been seen in other Cases; And on which they laid so Great a *Stress*, no less than the Preservation of both *Church* and *State*, at this time; Was the *Rejecting* such a *Bill* as this, on which the *Commons* Set their Hearts, more Likely to Create *Union* or *Division* betwixt the two *Houses*? And if a *Division* (as the Event has shew'd) is that the most Probable way to *Lessen* or *Enflame* the two Contending *Parties* through the *Kingdom*?

Can any Man Imagine my Lord *Bishop* of *Sarum* to be Guilty of such *Reasoning* as this?

And tho' the *House of Commons* have shew'd great *Temper* and *Moderation* under this *Disappointment*, of having their *Bill* Rejected, without so much as a *Conference* or Hearing their *Reasons*, or Giving any to them; even at the first Reading; yet will this take away the *Heart-burning* of the Friends of the Establish'd *Church* throughout the Nation? All of whom cannot be suppos'd Masters of such *Caution* and *Wisdom* as that which Governs that *Great* and *Honourable Assembly*.

And it must be Confess'd, that the *House of Commons*, for this Reason, and to make no *Disturbance*,

*Sturbance*, have been very *Passive*; more than we have seen, in lesser Matters, for some Ages.

And now that the Matter is so far over; and the *Parliament* up; wou'd the Bishop of *Sarum's* great *Prudence* and *Moderation* give him Leave to *Print* a *Speech* made during the *Heat* of those *Debates*, to *Rub* the *Sore* over again, and *Provoke* a fresh? This wou'd look rather like Carrying on the *War*, than letting it Sleep. And as if there were some further *Designs* still in View!

The Differences between the two *Houses*, at their last *Session*. Occasion'd Principally as we conceive, by the *Lords* Rejecting the *Bill*, may perhaps prove of Greater ill Consequence to the Support of our *Allies*, and *Portugal* and *Savoy* especially Quoted in the *Speech*, and make wider Differences in the Nation, than the Passing the *Bill* wou'd have done. There cannot possibly be a less Sign of that *Happy Calm* the *Speech* says the *Nation is now in*; than the Extraordinary and almost Un-preserved *Differences* between the two *Houses*; which may Render all Proceedings between them almost Impracticable, which the *Bishop* of *Sarum* cannot *Wish*, or *Contribute* towards it.

2. Is it Possible, that his *Lordship* of *Sarum*, wou'd so far *Expose* himself, as to *Arraign* all our *Protestant Princes* ever since the *Reformation*, one after another, as this *Speech* does, with all their *Parliaments* and *Councils*? And to Give that for his *Second Reason* against the *Bill*? And that among

them all, he shou'd lay most Load upon the wise Queen *Elizabeth*, and her *Councils*, for the Strict hand they kept over the *Dissenters*: And call that the *Blemish*, which all wise Men and *Writers* own to have been the *Security* of her *Reign*. And the Example of the after *Reigns* have Prov'd it to a Demonstration !

This Accuses likewise all the *Christian Kings* ever since *Constantine*, who, as *Custodes Utriusque Tabulae* thought themselves oblig'd to make Severe *Laws*, and *Punish* Exemplarily those who made *Schisms* and *Divisions* in the *Church*. But his *Lordship* is too well Acquainted with the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*, and the *Histories* of those times, to let any thing so *Reproachful* upon them fall from him.

This is the same Argument which the Mutinous *Congregation* made use of against *Moses* and *Aaron*, for their *Severity* in the Busines of *Korah* ( which was only a Dispute betwixt *Episcopacy* and *Presbytery*, and no Part of their *Worship* or *Doctrine* concern'd) *Saying*, *Ye have Killed the People of the Lord*. Num. xvi. 41.

These were more *Capital Proceedings* than those this Speech Complains of in *Queen Elizabeth's Reign*; and the severe *Act* in the 35 Year cfit, that *Punishes Meetings with Imprisonment, Banishment, and Death*. But this Speech go's on, and says, That the *Repeal of that Act past in both Houses in King Charles's time*. He do's not tell in which King *Charles*'s time. This is one of this Author's *Secrets* ! But adds, *And it is known by what Management it was, that it was not tendred*

*to the Royal Assent.* Here again he do's not tell to whom *it is known*, And I dare say there were many in that House who knew nothing at all of it, and therefore ought to have been Inform'd. How cou'd any Man make the *Bishop of Sarum* speak in such a *Blind* and *Gossiping* Manner, in things that requir'd the Cleareſt Proof !

Next he falls upon King James I. and says, *The Severities in his Reign cast a Blot on it.* But he Names none. That wou'd have been a *Task*. It was so far otherwise, That his *Loosning the Reigns of Government*, which Queen Elizabeth kept *Streit* upon the *Necks* of the *Dissenters*, gave them Opportunity to Embroil and Disturb his *Reign in England*, as they had, in most Barbarous manner, done before in *Scotland*.

One wou'd have thought he should have ſlipt over the *Reign* of his Son King Charles I. as to *Severities* us'd by him against the *Dissenters*. Whose Un-precedented *Condescensions* to them Enabl'd them to Cut off his *Head* ! But this *Spiteful Writer* wou'd Miss no one *Episcopal Reign*. Therefore ſays of this, *And the Proceedings in the Star-Chamber, and the High Commission, in his (King James I.) Son's Reign are set forth by a Noble Historian, as things that did not a little Contribute to bring on us the Miseries of a Civil War.*

But did that *Noble Historian* give the *Clamours* that were Rais'd by the *Faction*, on these two Heads, as any Justifiable Reason (had they been True)

True) for what he calls<sup>s</sup> the *Rebellion*? But this Writer calls it only a *Civil War*. And again in this *Speech*, p. 7. *before the Wars*, says he. This is the *Shibboleth* of the *Whiggs*, who will not Allow that *War* to have been a *Rebellion*. But a Just *Vindication* of their *Rights* and *Liberties*. And if the *Bishop* of *Sarum* had thought so, yet he wou'd not have Discover'd himself so far, as to Run into the *Cant* of the *Party*.

Again, so *Correct* a Writer as the *Bishop* is known to be, wou'd have Quoted the Place in the *Noble Historian* and not hid himself in *Generals*, which always give Suspicion, and put the Reader to Stage over the several large *Volumes* in *Folio*, and then only to *Guess* what he wou'd be at.

He wou'd not, as Doctor *K.* in a Pretended *Vindication* of this *Prince*, on the *Anniversary* of his *Martyrdom*, having Exemplify'd at large all the *Charges* of the *Rebells* against him, without one word in his *Justification*, either as to the *Falsehood* of the *Facts* Alledg'd; or the *Wickedness* of *Rebelling* on that Account, had they been True. He wou'd not have told the Tale all on one side. At which Rate, the Best *Actions* in the *World* may be Mis-Represented. And a *Vindication* of this sort, is the Bitterest *Invective* that can be Contriv'd. They are the *Wounds* of a *Friend*. And Exposes a Man *Open* and *Defenceless* to the *Darts* of his *Enemies*.

But that *Noble Historian* at the same time that, as a Faithful *Relator of Fact*, and not a *Writer for a Party*, he gives us all the *Mis-managements* of that *Reign*, in their full Weight ; yet he Conceals not, as *Rushworth*, what was said and Pleaded on the other Side ; as he did in the Case of *Ship-Money*, in the Dispute betwixt Arch-Bishop *Abbot* and Bi-*shop Laud*, &c. But this *Noble Historians*, having set down all that was objected as to the *Star-Cham-ber* and *High-Commission*, do's not Offer to *Defend* or *Excuse* any of the *Mis-managements* that were in these *Courts*. And what *Court* ever was there, of so long Continuance as these *Courts* had been, wherein no *Mis-management* Cou'd be found ? But for *Designing Men* to *Enflame* a *Nation* and *Raise Rebellion*, on such *Pretences* as never were, or will be Wanting, in any *Form* of *Government* whatso-ever, while *Men* have the *Administration* ; As it is most *Wicked* before *God*, by whom *Kings* do *Reign* : And utterly Subverts all *Constitutions* ; So do's it bring with it infinitely Greater *Destructi-on* and *Ruin* to the *People* of all Sorts, than those *Grievances* they pretend to *Redress* by it. Which this *Noble History* do's Lively set forth as in a *Picture*. And is of no Advantage to this *Speech-maker*. Who go's on to the next *Reign*, and says, *The Proceedings in King Charles the seconds Reign were severe and set on with bad Desings.* He tells not what these *Designs* were. For that woud have Requir'd some *Proof* ! And as to the *Severities*, he

he shou'd have shew'd what they were, and that they were not *Deserv'd* on the side of the *Dissenters*. But be what they will, they are Chargeable on the *Parliament*, more than on the *King*. The first *Parliament* after his *Restoration*, were yet *Smarting* with the *Wounds* they had Receiv'd from the Bloody *Rebellion*; There was not an Honest and *Loyal Family* in *England* that had not Deeply *Suffered* both in *Persons* and *Estates*; that were not yet *Lamenting* their *Fathers, Sons, Brothers, or near Relations*, who had been *Murther'd, Imprisoned, Banish'd, Sequester'd, &c.* And all *Undone*.

So that their *Moderation* is much more to be Admir'd, that they were not more *Severe* against the *Authors* of all this; than that they shou'd make some Restraining *Laws*, to Prevent those *Miseries* being Repeated.

And the Continual Attempts of the same *Faction*, from the very *Year* of the *Restoration*, to the last Minute of that *King's Life*, by new *Rebellions* and *Plots*, to Destroy the *King*, and *Re-Act* their *Tragedy of Blood* and *Desolation*, wou'd not suffer the *Parliament* to forget what they had done before; or ever to consent to an *Act of Toleration*; tho' often Press'd by the *King* himself. Who not only *Pardon'd* some of the very *Regecides*, and preferr'd the *Heads* of the *Faction* to most of the *Places of Power and Honour*; but ventur'd Disputes with his *Parliament* for several *Indulgences* he Granted to them. For which they well Rewarded

warded him ! And now call his Proceedings *Severe* !

But this *Speech* says, there was a *Secret* in it. *That it will Amaze all that know not the Secret of that time.* This *Secret* we Suppose must be *Popery*, That his *Indulging* the *Dissenters*, was with Design to Break the *Church of England*, and Introduce *Popery*. And so of the *Indulgence* Granted by King *James II.*

But where was the *Severity* to the *Dissenters*, Supposing them *Indulg'd* for this End ? The Greater *Severity* and grand *Design* was against the *Church of England*, as being the Chief Bullwark against *Popery*. And if the *Parliament* saw this, it was a good *Reason* why neither of these two *Kings* cou'd perswade them to pass an *Act* of *Toleration* of the *Dissenters*.

And it makes Good that stated *Politick* of the *Church of Rome*, That the first Step to be made to Ruin the *Church of England*, is, To give *Tolerance* to the *Dissenters*. And we have seen that Method pursu'd by as many of our *Kings* as we can suspect to have had that *Design*.

However the Matter of *Fact* is plain, That whatever *Severities* were against the *Dissenters* in the *Reigns* of King *Charles II.* and King *James II.* came from the *Parliament*, and not from either of these *Kings*.

And if we may take the sense of the *People* from their *Representatives* in *Parliament*, then the

Major Number and most Considerable are, and always have been on the side of the Church against the *Dissenters*. Contrary to what they wou'd make us now believe, to Aggrandize their Party.

If it be said, That the Parliament Granted a *Toleration* in the last Reign, I will Answer in the words of this *Speech*, That it will Amaze all that do not know the Secret of that Time.

And if no more was then meant than a *Tolerance*, the Parliament now Agrees with it. But wou'd Explain it, to Extend no further, which is all the *Quarrel*. And may Defeat some *Secrets*! And gives Us the more *Immediate Sense* of the *Nation*.

This *Speech* thinks it strange, that in the *Reign* of K. Charles II. In a time both of *War*, and of a *Plague*, such an *A&t* as the *Five Mile A&t shou'd have Pass'd*. Was that a Time to Disoblige the *Dissenters*, and put new *Restraints* upon them? It seems that *Parliament* thought so, and that it was the most Proper *Method* to Secure Peace at *Home*, while we were Engag'd in a *War* Abroad. And the *Event* shew'd it, for there were no ill *Consequences* from it, in that *War*. It may be said, that this came from the *Good Nature* of the *Dissenters*! But it seems that *Parliament* had no mind to Trust *wholly* to that, but thought some other *Precaution* was necessary.

And the *Council* of their *Great Ones* that Sat in *London*, who receiv'd their *Directions* from An-

ther in *Holland*, who Sat with the *States*; and Concerted the Murder of the *King*, and the *Burning of London*; and fix'd that same *Day* for it on which it was *Burn'd*, as was fully Prov'd at the Tryal of *Eight* of them who were *Executed* for it, *four Months* before it came to pass, which you may see in the *London Gazette* of April 30. 1666. which yet did not hinder the Execution of their Design in Burning the *City*, the same *Day* that had been Perfix'd. I say this shews, That it was Well for the *Governments* then that they had something Else to Trust to, besides the *Good Nature* of these Men ! And that it was but *Necessary* to keep them at *Five Miles* Distance from any *City* or *Town Corporate*, &c. as the *A&E Directs*. And this the Rather, because it was then a Time of *War*.

And the *Parliament* might be the more Induc'd to this, for that in the former *Rebellion of Forty One*, the *Covenanters* enter'd into a *Treaty* with the *French King* to Assist them against K. *Charles I.* as is told by their own Historian *Rushworth*, in his *Collections*, *Par. 2. Vol. 2. p. 956*, and *1037 ad Ann. 1639. 15 Carol.* And in the Lord *Clarendon's History* lately Publish'd, *Vol. 1. p. 103*, and *244*. And that was a Time of *War* too.

Now woud the *Bishop of Sarum* have brought this Instance of the *Five Mile A&E*, made in time of *War*. to Fortify his Argument of the *Unseasonableness* of the *Bill* against *Occasional Conformity*, because this is a Time of *War*? His Lordship is

not us'd to Argue thus against himself! And to give no better Reason, than they who know the Secret of that Time! What Secret in an *Act* of Parliament? Let any Read the *Act*, 17 Car. 2. c. 2. And they will see the Reason, viz. The Rebellious Principles and Practices, and Restless Spirit of these People.

As little wou'd his Lordship say what follows, *That soon after the Restoration, it had been a very easy thing to have made up all Differences amongst Us; but the Design was to Enflame them, and that matter was far Driven; as we all know.* Now I know no body that *Knows* any such thing, nor, I dare say, this Writer neither. For the matter of Fact was quite otherwise. The King Granted a Commission in the Year 1661, to several Bishops and Divines of the Church of England, and to the Principal of the Dissenting Ministers, to meet together, and see if they cou'd Compose Matters, and Heal the Schism. The Dissenters gave in several Exceptions against our Liturgy, to have such and such things Alter'd. The Bishops, &c. did Consent to several of their Alterations, to shew they were of a Temper to Heal and Yield as far as they Cou'd. Therefore Demanded of the Dissenters, to give in All their Exceptions, so that if they were Comply'd with, they wou'd Promise to Conform and Heal the Schism. But this the Dissenters Cou'd not be brought to; nor can to this Day. They make many Exceptions, but will not tell

tell any *Conditions* upon which they will *Conform*. Because they will not *Speak out*, That they woud have *All*. And nothing less will Please them.

Now the *Biskop* knowing all this to be *Exactly True*, woud never give it that *False* and *Malicious Turn*, as in this *Speech*, against the *King* and *Church of England*, in favour of the *Dissenters*, and against the *Bill*.

3. The Third Reason, p. 4. is as little Becoming the *Sagacity*, as *Prudence* and *Honesty* of the *Bishop*. That the Men who Promoted that *Bill without Doors*, were known and avow'd *Enemies to the Government*. For will not this bring the *Reflection* within *Doors* too ? Against all who *Voted* for it. And some of them *Wrote* for it also. And can any think that the *Bishop* woud lay himself so open the *second time* in *Print*, to the *Censure* of that *House*, who had shew'd their *Displeasure* against some of his former *Writings*; which Touch'd them not so near as to make them *Known and Avow'd ENEMIES to the Government* !

Were there not Multitudes of *Pamphlets* wrote *without Doors* against that *Bill* ? Why then might not some *Write* for it ? And how come they to be *Enemies to the Government* more than the others ? Is Writing for the *Security* of the *Church*, being an *Enemy to the Government*.

But must the Justice of that *Bill* be measur'd on either side, by the Qualifications of those who are *For* or *Against* it ? Then, be it known, That there

there is not one *Deist*, nor one *Socinian* in *England*, but who are every one of them most vehemently *Against* that *Bill*; as well as All the *Whiggs* and *Republicans*. And I may Add, the *Debauchees*, the *Profligate*, and the *Prophane*, who *Despise* and *Ridicule* all *Religion*, and therefore woud not be under the *Restraint* of any. And several *Pamphlets* have come from that *Quarter*, Running down the *Bill*, so that we see whom the *Rejecting* that *Bill* did *Gratify*. On the other hand, several of the *Sober* and *Conscientious Dissenters* have found no Fault with it, are Content with their *Toleration*; and think that they ought not, in *Prudence* to Press for more, least they thereby Render themselves *Suspected* to the *Government*; And do Highly *Condemn*, and have *Wrote* against *Occasional Conformity* for *Places*, as a *Reproach* upon their *Profession*; And Desire to be *Distinguish'd* from such.

Therefore it cannot be, That the *Bishop* of *Sarum* shou'd Advance a *Topick* which so Evidently makes against the *Cause* he wou'd maintain. We must suppose he had other Reasons for Voting against that *Bill*. This cou'd be none of them.

And as little Possible is it that he shou'd Insinuate *Popery* against any one for Proposing, *That we should Abate the Regal Supremacy, and they ( the Roman Catholicks ) the Papal*. Is *Abating* the *Pope's Supremacy* a sign of Inclinations to *Popery*?

And for the Regale or Regal Supremacy, the Bishop knew very well ( unless he wou'd Censure a Book without Reading it ) That that Author did Agree with his Lordship's own Sentiments concerning it. And made great use of his Lordship's Authority in it. As p. 66. second Edit. his Lordship is Quoted, shewing, That the Bishops oppos'd the Queen's (Elizabeth's) Supremacy, as set forth in that Oath that is, the Oath of Supremacy, till it was further Explain'd. And that the Queen Refus'd to be call'd Head of the Church. And That that Title cou'd not be justly given to any Mortal.

His Lordship himself has not thought this Subject Unworthy of his Pen. His Learned History of the Regale is still Read with Great Pleasure. Wherein p. 30, &c. p. 93, &c. 190, &c. and p. 209. he give several Instances of Emperours, Kings and Princes, who have Renounc'd and Given up their Regale, out of Principle of Conscience as not Belonging to them, and a most Wicked thing for them to Retain it, tho' Enjoy'd by their Ancestors, and settled on them by the Laws of the Land. And p. 75. he ascribes the total over-throw of the Greek Church to the Regale Assum'd by their Emperours, in taking the Election of Bishops to themselves. And coming to the State of the Latine Church, he says p. 241. That the King and the Pope agreed to Divide the Promotion to all Prelacies between them.

And do's not this Lead one Naturally to Desire an Abatement on Both sides ? Did not the Bishop

*bishop* think so when he wrote this? And wou'd he call his own *Doctrine Popish*, in Another: Wou'd he Mention a *Book*, where all this is Contain'd, with any Unkind *Reflection*; And that only for this? Wou'd it not be to Cast the *Reflection* Directly upon Himself? From whom if that *Author* did not Learn it; Yet we must Suppose he was Mightily *Confirm'd* in it, by the Concurrent Sense of a Man of his Lordship's vast *Capacity* and *Learning*.

In the Book, p. 268, The *Tenths* and *first Fruits* paid by the *Bislops* and *Clergy*, first to the *Pope*, and since to the *Crown*, are likewise Mention'd, as an Unjustifiable Part of the *Regale*, which it were to be Wish'd were Given up. This the *Queen* has most *Christianly* done. Is that *Popery* too! Perhaps it might have been so Call'd in that *Author*, if her *Majesty's* most Gracious Act had not Interven'd.

And whenever the Time shall come, that God shall so Move the Heart of any of our *Princes*, to follow the Example of those Godly *Kings* and *Princes* ( Mention'd by this Learned *Bishop* ) in Giving up their *Regale* likewise as to the *Election of Bislops*, and *Presentation* to *Church Benefices* ( which I hope yet to see ) I doubt not it will be Receiv'd with as Universal a *Joy* and *Acclamations* of *Gratitude*, by the *Clergy*, as they have Express'd for her *Majesty's* Grant of the *Tenths* and *First Fruits*. And will be thought as little *Popery* as that.

And

And which is most of all, the *Dissenters* ( whom we now *Court!* ) cannot Except against it. For it is the Avow'd *Principle* of them all, of whatso-ever *Denominations*. And the *Erasianism* of our *Regale*, is their most Clamorous *Objection* against Us. And the only one that has any *Appearance* of *Truth* in it. For it is most Certain that *Christ* did not Build his *Church* upon the *Foundation* of *Kings* and *Parliaments*, but of the *Apostles* and their *Successors*; and Established a *Regiment* of the *Church* within her self, *Independent* of all *Earthly Powers*. By which she was *Govern'd* in her *First* and *Purest Ages*; And stood the *Shock* of the most violent *Persecutions* from the *Kings* and *Princes* of the *World*. Therefore they cannot be Necessary to her *Constitution*, without whom she subsisted for 300 years, before there was any *Christian King* upon the Earth. Or will any say, That the *Frame* of the *Church* was not *Perfect*, before that Time when the most visible *Corruptions* came in upon her; and since which, she has grown *Worse* and *Worse*? And, which is *Worst* of all, while under the *Regale* of *Popes*, and *Princes*, and *Dis-Arm'd* of those *Inherent Powers* with which *Christ* did *Invest* her, she knows not how to Help her self: Nor can Exercise her *Discipline*, but under the *Direction* of *Worldly Politicks*, or Mere *Humour* of those who have her in *Subjection*.

All the *World* knows, That the *Regale* was not the *Primitive Frame* of the *Church*. It cou'd not

be before there were *Christian Kings*. Therefore this Learned Bishop cou'd never be charitable of so Crude an Expression as that which next follows in this Speech, viz. *Our Legal Establishment founded upon the PRIMITIVE Pattern.* Nor wou'd he call this, *The true Measure of our Church*; And that those who Rise above it, are as much out of the way, as those who Fall below it. This implies that the *Regale* was always at one Stay, at least since the *Reformation*. For if it be not *Fix'd* and *Settled* it self, how shall we know to keep so to it, as not to Rise above it, or Fall below it? Otherwise, that may be *Above* or *Below* it at one time, which is not so at another. Now no Man in the Nation can know better than my Lord Bishop, who wrote that Excellent *History of the Reformation*, how much the *Regale* has alter'd since that Time. The *Title of Head of the Church*. The King's Vice Gerent in *Ecclesiasticals*. The Bishops holding during the Kings Pleasure. The *Ecclesiastical Commission*. And several other things, then set up, and Highly in *Vogue* are now *Dead* and *Gone*, and *Exploded* by every body. These are *Reformations from the Reformation*. And indeed the Truth is, That the *English Divines* have been *Explaining away the Regale*, ever since the first *Heat of the Reformation*. As you may see among many others in *The Subject of Church Power in whom it Resides, &c.* By that Learned Divine Dr. Simon Louth, Chap. vi. Printed 1685. very well known

known to the *Bishop*. So that this is no *New or Revolution Doctrine*. And his *Lordship* has well Instructed Us in his *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation*, Printed 1688, p. 18, 19, &c. what Stress to lay upon some *Flourishes* and *Stretches* in *Acts of Parliament*, that seem to favour the *Regale*.

But the *Author* Nam'd, and the *Book* Meant in this *Speech* Endeavours ( *Sect. ix.* ) to Solve the *Objections* from our *Laws* and *Acts* of *Parliament* since the *Reformation*. in a Milder strain, without giving them any *Hard Words*, or putting them off as *Flourishes*. And where he Opposes the Opinion of others he Studioiusly avoids Personal Reflections or any thing that may Provoke, other than Pursuing his Argument Plainly, and with as much *Force* as he can.

Therefore if the *Bishop* had made that *Speech*, we Cannot suppose that *Author* could have been Meant in the Excuse his *Lordship* is made to give for himself and other *Bishops*. thus, *The Station we are in, sets us above the Answering every Spiteful Writer*. And the Common Agent both for *PAPISTS and JACOBITES in Distress* ( as his *Lordship* is call'd in this *Speech* ) And he who ( as there is said ) Pleadeth with so much reverence, for *Excusing the Depriv'd Bishops from the Oaths*: And certifies, *That how hardly soever he may be Treated by others, he shall never Treat any Hardly in matters of Conscience*. I say such a Man as this could

not have born so *Hard* upon the *Depriv'd*, as this *Speech* do's, p. 4. Where they are Represented as *Enemies to the Government, who deny the Queen's Title, and are looking to one beyond Sea.* And adds, *Can any think that these who Separate from our Church, and have Rais'd a Schism in it, can be Zealous for the Peace and Order of the Church?* If his Lordship had thought so, he would have *Voted* for the *Bill*, to keep such *Schismaticks* out of *Places of Power and Trust*, that they might not *Hurt the Church*? And if no body Look'd *beyond Sea*, but those here Accus'd, I believe her *Majesty* wou'd have less Trouble upon the *Throne*. And which of these have most Reason to wish well to her, and do in good Earnest *Pray* for her *Life and Preservation*, I leave it to the *Bishop* himself to Determine.

But do not they Love the *Church*, who *Suffer* for her, and *Write* for her; and the *Chief*, and indeed *Only* Objection against them, is, That they wou'd Raise her too *High*? Whence the *Opprobrious* name ( as it is thought ) of *High-Church Men* and *High-Fliers* is Given to them; And even that of *Possibly Affected* too, to help out the *Cry*, and *Mark* them out for the *Mobb!* Tho' that Charge cannot be laid upon any one of them, that I ever heard of, with the least *Colour* or *Pretence*. And several of them have Employ'd their Pens against *Popery*. Even the *Author* here Struck at, and in the same *Book* Objected to, has Attack'd *Rome* in the

*Tendereſt part*, that of her *Supremacy*. He has indeed Propos'd *Terms of Union*, whereby to restore *Catholick Communion*. But what are they ? Every one of them is for their Coming to Us, not we to them. For them to Quit their *Errors*, not that we shou'd go over to them. And what *Christian* wou'd not wish a *Reconciliation* upon these *Terms* ? All would, except those Politicians who make use of the word *Popery* to serve their *Deſigns*, to *Enflame* and to *Rebel* ! Who *Practice* the *Principles* of *Popery*, while they *Cry out*, against it ! Who think it Lawful to *Lye* for *God*, and *Serve* *Him* by *Breaking* his *Commandments* ! This others Dare not venture upon. And think it the Like-liest way to bring in *Popery*, by Provoking *God* against Us. Who wants not our *Virtues* to help *Him* to *Govern* the *World*, much leſs our *Vices*. And whoever Preach *Trusting* any thing to *Providence*, and the Containing Men within the *Bounds* of their *Duty*, are Reckon'd *Disaffected*. It is Meer *Cant* in our *Politicks*. So that let a Man *Write* against all the *Errors* of *Popery*, and let him take all the Pains he can, to bring others over from them; and for this Suffer the *Persecution* of the *Tongue* from them (as well as from others) and be call'd an *Arch-Heretick* by them, as I have seen in *Letters* concerning that same *Author*, as well as heard their *Reproaches* of him, for his Opposition to them; yet all this Notwithstanding, he must be a *Papist*, he shall be a *Papist* ! While he stands out against  
that

that Popish Principle, of a Good End Sanctifying the most Wicked Means. And Blames it in Presbyterians or Others, who think we may do any thing for the Good of Mother Church, to Lye, Betray, Swear, and For-Swear, to Murder, and Depose their Kings, for the Good of Religion! What can he be but a Papist, who Talks at this Rate! And if we had a Worse Word to Throw at him, he shou'd have it. This he took no Notice of in several Poor Pamphlets that Bark'd at him. But seeing it again Repeated in what bears the Name of my Lord Bishop of Salisbury, he said it must be an Abuse put upon his Lordship, for that it was Impossible he shou'd fall into that Mistake, for two Reasons, First, Because it was Senseless; And Secondly. Very Malicious. Therefore I have taken this Pains to Vindicate his Lordship from the Imputation of that Speech. Considering that his High Station, sets him Above answering every spiteful Writer. And who would Believe, That he who so Charitably and Vehemently Pleaded for Excusing the Depriv'd from the Oaths shou'd afterwards have them Hunted to Death for not Taking them!

4. A Fourth Reason given against the Bill, in the 8th. Paragraph of this Speech, is, That the Dissenters may apprehend the Toleration is Aim'd at. This it is not Mention'd, or any thing like it. And that The next step may be for their Wives and Children. For which this Reason is produc'd. If one Picks at a great Dike that keep out the Sea it will

will be thought, how small a Breach soever he makes at first that he Designs a total Inundation. --- So Men will grow Jealous, and be on their Guard.

I say the *Bishop* could not Argue at this Rate against the *Bill*, because it makes Men strongly for it. For has not the *Government* as much Reason to be *Jealous*, and stand upon their *Guard*, when they see the *Dissenters* from the *Establishment* Picking at our *Dikes*; and grown already so *Rampant* as to *Dispute* it with us in *Parliament*? That they will not be Content with a Full and True *Toleration*, but must be in *Power* too. Tho' they will Allow of no *Toleration* to the *Church*, where they have *Power*, as in *Scotland*. Must every body be *Jealous* but the *Government*!

And as for the *Cry* of *Wives* and *Children*, it is Highly *Seditious*, and ought to put th. *Government* more upon their *Guard*. At this Rate, no *Law* can be made to Restraine any sort of People, in any manner of thing, but they may presently Cry up to *Arms*, and say, The *Design* is against our *Lives*, our *Wives* and *Children*! And in the present *Case*, the *Cause* still Remains tho' the *Bill* be Rejected For the *Commons* Voted it. And may Carry it ano her time. And what *Security* can the *Dissenters* have? Can any *Party* have, who are not of the *Church* *Establish'd* in any Country? Why truly none at all but to have the whole *Power* put into thir own hands. How otherwise can they be *Secure*? All *Subjects* are in the *Power* of

of every *Government*. And to Ask *Security* against it, is neither more nor less, than a Pretence of *Rebellion*. For no *Security* can be Given, but a total over-throw of the *Government*, and putting it into the Hands of those, who have *Jealousies* and *Fears*, which Cannot otherwise be *Cured* ! To *Sap* the *Foundations* of a *Government* has been heard of. But I believe this is the first time, That *Dissenters* from the *Legal Establishment*, ever put Themselves so upon the *Level* with the *Government*, as to Talk of the *Government* sapping their *Foundations*, or *Picking* at their *Dikes* !

And that for no Greater a Cause, than when they Enjoy a Full and Free *Toleration*, to say, it may be taken from them ; and that they Cannot be *Secure*, nor will Rest *Satisfy'd*, unless they are Admitted into *Places* of *Power* and *Trust* in the *Government*, thereby to *Secure* themselves !

But of all Men the *Bishop* of *Sarum* Cou'd not Advance such an *Argument* as this, who is *Naturaliz'd* in *Holland*, and so well Understands their *Constitution* ; whereby tho' the *Dissenters* from the *Church Establish'd*, are Allow'd a *Toleration*, as to *Religion* ; yet they are not Admitted into their *Parliament*, or *Magistracy*. And if they shou'd set up such *Pleas* for it, as our *Dissenters* do here, his Lordship is sensible, That the very *Toleration* they now Enjoy, wou'd soon be taken from them, if the *States* shou'd once Perceive such use to be made of it, as thereby to Thrust themselves into the *Government*. His

His Lordship was in *Holland* when Pentioner *Fagel* wrote that *Letter* ( which was *Printed* ) in Answer to Mr. *James Stuart*, a little before the *Revolution*; where he Clears his Highness the Prince of *Orange* from the *Insinuation*, as if he Intended or wou'd Endeavour to bring the *Dissenters* in *England* into *Places*; But declar'd that he Meant no more, than to support that *Toleration*, as to *Religion*, which they then Enjoy'd from K. *James*. And were very Thankful for it.

Now the *Bishop* who was in the *Secret* when this *Letter* was wrote, and knew the *Pretensions* then set up, wou'd never run so *Counter* to them, and let the World know that they were not *Sincerely* Meant, as by Arguing on the Contrary side in this *Speech*. He cou'd not do it, who never Alter'd his *Sentiments*, and can Defie the Worst *Enemy* he has to Instance any *one step* of his *Life*, wherein he *Prevaricated* the least Tittle; or Acted not always *Openly* and *above Board* for the *Church*, and against the *Dissenters*.

And King *William* did so far perform what Pentioner *Fagel* promis'd in his Name, that he left the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts* in full force. And no doubt with the Consent of the *Bishop*, who as this *Speech* says, *Knew somewhat of Affairs in the last Reign*.

And his Lordship knows well, That no new *Severity*, was intended against the *Dissenters* by this *Bill*, but only to Secure the former *Corporati-*

on and *Test-Acts* which they had found *Jesuitical Methods of Eluding to the Scandal of Christianity.*

In Answer to this, it is offer'd in the 6th Paragraph of this *Speech*, p. 3. That the Lord *Clifford* got *some to Move for a Clause in favour of the Dissenters*, in the *Test-Act*. And that it was *Stoppt by Alderman LOVE, &c.*

This the *Bishop* cou'd not say, for he knows the Matter of Fact to be otherwise. As to that of Lord *Clifford*, let it pass among the *Secrets*, with which this *Speech* Answers *Arguments*. And it matters not whether it be True or False. For what is it against the Authority of an *Act of Parliament*, who *Mov'd* it ; or if *some body* got *some body* to Speak *for* or *against* it ?

But as to Alderman *Love*, and the *Dissenters* Part in it, it was thus ; They had not a mind to have their *Toleration* stand upon the Foot of the King's Dispensing Power. First, Because they are no Friends of *Prerogative*. And Secondly, They thought it *Surer* to have it by *Act of Parliament*, and they heartily Endeavour'd it, contrary to what this *Speech* says, against all Probability of *Truth*. That they wou'd not so much as *Accept* of it ; and that Alderman *Love* did *stop the Clause in favour of the Dissenters*, which Lord *Clifford* got *some to move*.

Whereas

Whereas Alderman Love did himself move in the *House of Commons*, That they woud open their Doors Wider, to let in *Protestant Dissenters*, who were willing to Come in upon Reasonable *Terms*. The *House* Receiv'd the *Motion* very Readily, and gave Alderman Love a Fortnights time, to know what *Terms* the *Dissenters* woud Propose. And the *Alderman* having Try'd, made his Report, very Frankly, That truly they cou'd Agree to no *Terms*, for that what one *Lik'd*, another *Oppos'd*, &c.

And this is the Reason why, as this *Speech* says, (but gives not this, or any other Reason) *That little Progress was indeed made, in the Bill order'd to be brought in for the Ease of Protestant Dissenters*. For who can Please them who cannot agree among themselves, what will *Content* them? That is they will not tell the *Secret*, that their *Aim* being to Gain the whole Power, both in *Church* and *State* to themselves, they must never tell what will *Reconcile* them, but always keep up a *Pretence of Quarrel*. And many Well-Meaning-Men, as Alderman Love, &c. are Deceiv'd in their Pretences to *Conscience*, while *Empire* is their Design.

And as many as have Try'd them, have found it so. They have been often Provok'd, both by *Públick Authority*, and in several *Discourses* in *Print*, to Name the *Particulars*, which if Granted, woud *Reconcile* them. And they can never be

brought to it. But keep off in *Generals*, and Plead *Tender Consciences*, without *Limitation*.

Alderman *Love* then Declar'd, that the *Dissenters* Desir'd no more than a Bare *Tolaration*, to serve *God* according to their *Consciences*. But some time after, when things look'd more Favourably towards the *Dissenters*, the same Alderman *Love* Mov'd for their being Restor'd to their *Birth-Rights*, and the Privilege of *English Men*, to Enjoy *Places* and *Preferments*. Upon which Sir *Thomas Clarges*, who was very Intimate with him, and had gone along with him in the former Motion for a *Toleration*, told him this Contradicted what he had Affirm'd before in the *House*; That the *Dissenters* Aim'd at no more than a *Toleration*; the *Alderman* Reply'd, But our *Party* is Stronger now than it was Then.

They are for *Inching*. And if you Give it them, will take an *Ell*. They are not now Content with the Throwing out this *Bill*; but they woud Explain away the *Corporation* and *Test Acts*, as this *Speech* Endeavours. And by the *Arguments* advanc'd in it, the *Question* is now with them, not whether they will be *Allarm'd* at *New Acts* made against them?

But whether they will not be as much *Allarm'd* if our *Old Laws* are Maintain'd? And will not Call this, Picking at their *Dikes*; and *The next step will be for their Wives and Children, &c!* They pretend to be Afraid of what the *Government* will do.

do. Tho' they have all the *Security* the *Government* can Give them, that no such thing is Intended. The *Queen* has Repeated her *Assurance* from the *Throne*, that she will Maintain their *Toleration*. And both the *Lords* and *Commons*, who Voted for this *Bill*, have said the same.

Now what other *Security* wou'd they have? Suppose an *Act* of *Parliament* were *Pass'd* for it. Wou'd that be any more than the *Act* they have for it already? For who knows not that an *Act* of *Parliament* may be *Repeal'd*? Therefore when Men Ask a *Security* that is *Impossible* to be given; and, at the same time, Declare that they will not take the *Queen's Word*, nor that of *All the Lords* and *Commons* (who are *Nemine Contradicente* for the *Toleration*) it is Easie to Guess what sort of *Security* they wou'd be at! Even to put it out of the *Power* of *Queen* *Lords* or *Commons* to *Hurt* them! For which there is but one way in the World, that is, to take the *Power* into their own hands.

But at the same time that they Declare such open *Distrust* of the *Faith* of the *Government*, and will not Rest satisfy'd with its *Promises* to them; They take it most *Heinously*, if any Suggest the Least *Suspicion* of their Good *Intentions*, tho' without their *Promises* (for none such have they Given) or woud mind them of their *Former* Doings; or have the *Government* be upon its *Guard*, or have the least *Eye* towards *Them*; tho' they

they are not only *Picking at our Dicks*, but have set their *Pioneers* to Work at *Noon-Day*, in *Parliament*, *Press*, and *Pulpit*.

But if any take Notice of this, tho' never so Apparent they are Immediately *Branded* with the Name of *High-Allies*, Men of no *Moderation*, *Spiteful Writers*, nay *Papists* and *Jacobites*! And no other *Answer* is Given to *Demonstration* and plain *Fact*. For none other can be Given.

But tho' they Trust not *Promises* (knowing of what *Weight* their own are) yet they love to have them *Repeated* often, that they may *Cavil* at them, and see what *Holes* they can Pick in them. Nay, if they are not *Repeated* and *Repeated* where there is no Occasion for them, this will be made a *Positive Argument*, that they were never sincerely Intended. Thus in the *Occasional Bill* brought in last year, there was a *Preamble* fortifying the *Act of Toleration*. Which was of no other use than to shew that the *Commons* did not Intend to Invade that *Act*. For an *Act of Parliament* is of Force, till it be *Repeal'd*. And 100 Confirmations of it, add no strength to it. Therefore it was not Repeated in the *Bill* brought in last *Session*. Now see what use is made of this. The *Speech* says Paragr. 18. p. 7. They (the words in favour of Toleration) are now left out, with great Sincerity, no doubt, for those who do not Intend to Maintain the Toleration, act a very Honest part when they will not Profess it. This is a Downright Arraigning the

the whole *House of Commons* of the utmost *Perfidie* and *Dissimulation*. As if they had never *Intended* what they so Solemnly *Profess'd* in favour of *Toleration*. For it was the same *House of Commons* that brought in both *Bills*. And speaking of the first *Bill*, wherein that *Preamble* wa<sup>s</sup>, their *Sincerity* therein is Compar'd to that of the *Inquisition*, which Delivers *Hereticks* to be *Burnt*, with an *Abjuration* that no *Harm* be done them. This is a *Decent Treatment* of the Honourable *House of Commons* and *Representative* of the *Nation*! And shews with what *Sincerity* the Omission of this *Preamble* in the *second Bill* is Quarrel'd, when we see what use they make of it in the *first*.

And it likewise Teaches us, how *Feasible* it is, to seek to *Please* these Men. *Promise* or not *Promise* it is all one! They can *Cavil* on both Sides! And if their *Toleration* was Invaded, they cou'd *Quarrel* no more than they do. They have given all the *Provocations* to it that is *Possible*. While they have made it Apparent that it is *Impossible* to *Please* them; with less than the Total overthrow of both *Church* and *State*, and having the whole *Reigns of Government* put into their own Hands. And which they must have, if they be Suffer'd to go on, as they have begun.

And can we suppose, that the *Bishop* of *Sarum* is in the *Secret* of Driving on such a Design? And was this too with a *Prospect Beyond Sea*?

But

But if any Stress was laid upon the *Preamble* omitted in the *second Bill*, it might have been easily Added by the *Lords*, and the *Commons*, we may suppose, wou'd not have been against it. That the *Speech* owns, and says, Paragr. 19. p. 7. *I know it may be said, Let us put in these words, and stand to them. But ( Answers ) still this will not lay the Apprehensions that the leaving out these Words must Raise.* That is, the Party did not Care for the *Words*, whether they were put into the *Bill*, or not. But being Resolv'd to Raise *Apprehensions*, and *Enflame*, they wou'd not Lose the *Opportunity* ! They wou'd not Accept of the *Words* now; it is Enough that they were once left out! How *Agreeable* was this, to the Large *Professions* made in the *Preamble* of this *Speech*, to follow the Admonition given to both *Houses* from the *Throne*, to Preserve *Peace* and *Union* among themselves? But this Reason given in this *Speech*, for Rejecting that *Bill*, is directly Picking a *Quarrel*. And Resolving not to be *Satisfied*. How frequent are *Additions*, *Amendments*, *Alterations* in *Bills* by either *House*, and often *Agreed to*, by *Conferences* with each other? But to say, as this *Speech* do's, we know you will *Agree* therefore we will not *Propose* it, is the first time ever such a Reason was given for Rejecting a *Bill*. And to *Bate* the *House* of *Commons* for this, and Try to Expose them to the *Nation* ! Such a *Proceeding*, such *Arguing* as this, could never befall the Lord *Bishop* of *Sarum* ! It looks more like *Legion*. And

And so do's what next follows, Paragr. 26. p. 7, 8. Which puts this Construction upon the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts*, that tho' they Requir'd all Men in Places, to be *in the Communion of the Church*, yet it was not Intended, *they shou'd always Continue to be so*. What ! Was it only the Pleasure to see these Mens *Faces* once at *Church*, for which these *Acts* were Made ? Or, was it, That *Employments* were not thought fit to be Entrusted in any Hands but of those who were in the *Communion of the Church*? This Speech argues, Parag. 6. p. 3. That these *Acts* were intended *Only* against the *Papists*. And that *it wou'd be hard to turn them against the other Dissenters*. And was it then Intended that a *Papist* shou'd only make his Appearance *once* or *so* at *Church*, to *Qualify* himself for a *Place*, and Return next Day *Openly* and *Bare fac'd* to *Mass* ! Sure the *Bishop* wou'd not put such *Childrens play* upon the *Wisdom* of the *Nation* ! And this *Construction* here put upon these *Acts* must either hold good for the *Papists*, or be of no use to the other *Dissenters*. Unless it be said, That instead of these *Acts* being made only against the *Papists*, and that the other *Dissenters* are not *Included*: You turn the Tables, and now say, That the *Papists* are not *Included*; and that these *Acts* were made only against the *Protestant Dissenters* ! Otherwise this Pritty *Construction* of these *Acts*, will look as *Invicuous* as it is *Ridiculous*.

V. After all the violent *Invectives* against the *Bill of Occasional Conformity* which are in this *Speech*, and making the Like a *Blemish* to all former *Reigns*, who can Believe that the *Bishop* wou'd make such a *Contradictory Conclusion*, as this *Speech* ends with, *Parag. 22. p. 8.* As for the *Enacting part*, when in a proper Time a *Bill shall be brought in*, *Disabling all to hold any Employment, except those who continue to be in the Communion of the Church of England*, I shall concurr in it heartily.

First, here is not only *Occasional Conformity* to the *Church*, but *continue to be*, a *constant Conformity* made the *Condition*.

And will not that be a *Blemish* in one *Reign*, as well as in *Another*? Will not the same *Pretences* lie of Invading *Toleration, Wives, Children, &c.* as Now.

We must therefore Suppose, that this *Speech-Maker* has some other *Reign* in view, when such a *Moderate Episcopacy* will be set up, as that the *Dissenters* from it will Deserve no *Quarter*, no *Toleration*; but be *Hunted and Persecuted*, as the *Church* now in *Scotland*. He tells us there is a *proper Time* coming, when he will *concur in it Heartily*. And then it will be no Breach of *Moderation*!

VI. Who can suppose him Guilty of such an *Un-Guarded Expression*, and *Savouring of Popery*, as, speaking of my *Lord's Grace of Canterbury*,

( Paragr.

(Paragr. 12. p. 5.) to call him *The Head of our Order*. The *Head of Bishops* is none but *Christ*. The *Pope* being *Flatter'd* with this *Title*, took it to himself. And built his *Supremacy* upon it. But we have Justly taken it from him ; and our own *Princes* have given it up, as too *Great* for any *Mortal*, as before Quoted from my Lord of *Sarum*. Therefore this might have been put upon any rather than upon his *Lordship*. He will never be the *First* to set up a *Head of Bishops*, or *Popery* in *England*.

He who is so Strenuous an Afferter of the *Liberty* and *Property* of the *People*, as to *Civil Affairs*; wou'd not Betray the *Church*, to put her under the *Despotick Sway* of an *Alterius Orbis Papa*, to give him Power to Deprive all the *Bishops* in the Kingdom, by own single Authority, as being *Head* of their *Order*.

And when he had done, to say, as this *Speech* makes him, p. 4. Paragr. 11. *I know no High Church but the Church of Rome*. This is like another Printed Speech I have seen, which was put upon another Noble Peer, who Arguing upon the Point of the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy*, in the former *Revolution of Forty-One*, said, *I think there is nothing Jure Divino, but God*.

But what cou'd the *Bishop* mean here by *High-Church*? He cou'd not Mean *High* in *Riches* and outward *Grandure*. That is too *Trifling* for the *Bishop*, and a Burlesking his *Lordship*. And if

*High in Authority* be meant, his *Lordship* knows very well, that the *Pope of Rome*, never Exercis'd a Greater *Authority* over his *Collegues the Bishops* within his Jurisdiction, than to *Deprive* them. And I believe he wou'd be Fuzled to find an Instance where the *Pope* did *Deprive* any *Bishop*, by his own single *Authority*, without such a *Bishop* being Judg'd by other *Bishops*.

It was Decreed in the *Council of Carthage*, A. D. 348. *Can. xi.* That a *Bishop* shou'd not be Try'd by less than *Twelve Bishops*. And the Council held there, A. D. 419. *Can. xii.* Confirms the same, if more *Bishops* cou'd not be had.

And when a *Bishop* was *Depriv'd* by *Twelve*, or as many *Bishops* as cou'd be got together, they were to Report the Whole *Cause*, with their *Proceedings*, to the other *Bishops* every where, that the Concurrence of the whole *Episcopal Collegue* might be had. Which method we find Exactly pursu'd in the Deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus*. *Euseb. Hist. L. vii. C. 30.*

The Great St. *Cyprian* Arch-Bishop of *Carthage*, at a *Council* held there, wherein he Presided, did Declare, That he took not upon him to be *Bishop* or *Head of Bishops*, every *Bishop* there having the same *Authority* in his own *Dioceſſ*, as he had in his, and the same Liberty to Differ from him in Judgment, as he from any of them; Each of them being Answerable to *Christ* the *Chief Shepherd*, for that Portion of his *Flock* committed to his Charge.

Charge. St. Cyprian pretended to no more than, according to the Stated Discipline at that Time, to be *Præses* or *Speaker* of the *Council*.

But to be *Head* and *Sovereign* over other *Bishops*, is what long after St. Cyprian's time, *Gregory the Great* Blaim'd in *John* then *Arch-Bishop* of *Constantinople*; and fore-told the Times of *Anti-Christ* a coming, when one *Bishop* did set himself so Above his *Colleagues* and *Fellow-Bishops*, as that he must *Judge* of them, but not they of him. No man knows these things better than my Lord of *Sarum*. And that according to the *Discipline* of the *Primitive Church*, *Arch Bishops* were *Deposable*. How is it then Possible, that he shou'd set up such a *Head* of *Bishops* in *England*, as is not *Deposable* by all the other *Bishops*, but every one of them *Deposable* by him?

And how cou'd he give the Name of *High-Church* to these who Oppose this *Absolute* and *Super-Papal Supremacy*, in the Hands of one Person; And wou'd have things Reduc'd to a more *Moderate*, and the *Primitive Frame*?

How cou'd he Charge *Distinction* of *High-Church*, and *Low-Church*, upon those here Call'd the *High-Church*, who find fault with the *Distinction*, and shew it to have been set up by the *Whiggs* and *Dissenters*, to *Divide* and *Blacken* the *Church* of *England*; and to have opportunity, under the Name of the *High-Church*, to vent all their *Venom* against the *Church* in General, her

*Liturgy, Rites, and Ceremonies, and whole Economy?*

Such Gross Mistakes as these, cou'd not Fall from the *Bishop of Sarum.*

VII. His Natural Modesty wou'd not let his own Mouth be the *Trumpet* of his Just Praises, as to tell how he, of all Men, least Deserv'd to be ill Treated by any body, and to say (Parag. 13. p. 5.) *In no one step or part of my Life, I ever gave the least occasion for it----- I had the Thanks of this House for my History of the Reformation---- Which was Wrote with an Honesty and Zeal that ought to set me beyond Suspicion.* But I own I began the World on a Principle of Moderation, which I have carry'd down through my whole Life. And Parag. 12. *We have in the whole course of our Lives adhered to the Interest of the Church, at all Perils, and in all Times, without ever once, in any particular, leaning to the Dissenters.* And Parag. 3. *We are so well known, and have liv'd so Long in a Publick Scene, and have Acted such a Part on it, that we may Reckon our selves above Calumnies.* Even St. Paul said, *He became a Fool in Glorying; but it was when others compell'd him to it.* Cou'd any thing have Compell'd the *Bishop of Sarum* to Compare Glorying with St. Paul? Did he ever think himself Caught up to the third Heaven?

But he says, ('ibid.) *We are the Disciples of the Cross.* And no Man has Preach'd it more than his Lordship: Or Preach'd Passive Obedience to a greater Height.

*Height.* Or kept Truer to it, or Suffer'd more for it, in every Step and Turn of his Life. Now tho' all this be most Exactly so, yet his Lordship wou'd never have become such a Fool, in Glorying, as to give the Detail of it thus himself. And where there was no need of it, in the House of Lords, who were all Witnesses of it.

VIII. He could never have had the Vanity to Thrust himself into all Secrets of State, even before he was in the Publick Scene, and had Acted such a Part on it, in the Reign of King Charles II. when he was not over much Trusted, as to say what is before Quoted, That such a thing Will Amaze all that do not know the Secret of that time. And in the next Parag. to tell a Secret of that time; which is Publickly known to be otherwise, as that the Lord Stafford told me ( says Speech ) in the Tower of an Oath of Secrecy, tender'd by the Earl of Bristol to a Meeting of Papists, &c. Was Dr. Burnet then Confessor to the Lord Stafford? Or wou'd he Reveal it? Was he Employ'd by the Government to Examine him? Or was he a very particular Confidant of his Lordship's, that he shou'd Entrust him with such an Important Secret? Wou'd he Boast of this Now, as if he were in all Secrets?

But it is Added in the Speech; That he ( Lord Stafford ) told it likewise at the Bar of this House. My Lord of Sarum was not then a Member of that House. Nor then present. And those Lords who were Present at the Lord Stafford's Examination,

nation, say the Quite contrary, that Lord *Stafford* did not tell any such thing at that *Bar*. There is nothing of it in the *Journals* of the *House of Lords*. And it is Probable that an *Oath of Secrecy* among the *Papists*, at that time of Day, in the Height of the *Popish Plot*, and Attested by the Lord *Stafford*, wou'd have been thought so Considerable, as, at least, to be *Mention'd*, and not totally *Forgotten*. And my Lord of *Sarum* ( who has Access to the *Journals* of the *House* ) cou'd not but Know all this ; and wou'd not have *Affronted* himself, and Sought to *Impose* upon the *House of Lords*, by *Asserting*, what he cou'd not *Prove*.

But Looking into that *Journal* upon this Occasion, there is a Passage in it, which has some Relation to the late Dispute betwixt the *House of Lords* and *Commons*, concerning the Power of the *Lords*, by their own Authority, to send for *Prisoners of State*; to be *Examined* by them, and *Committed* to other Prisons, if they thought fit. In which I will by no Means take upon me to Determine; only set down what the *Journal* says in that Case of the Lord *Stafford*, viz. That he was *Condemned* the 7th. of December, 1680. And the 18th. of the same December, The *Earl of Carlile* acquainted the *House* that the Lord *Stafford* wou'd make a Confession of what he knew concerning the *Plot*, and desir'd he might be brought to the *Bar* of that *House*. The *House* hereupon appointed an *Address* shoud be made to his *Majesty*, that he wou'd please

please to give leave for the bringing the said late Viscount *Stafford* to this House. And the King having been Attended with the *Addres*, and giving *Leave*, the Lord *Stafford* was sent for. And in the *Order* to the Lieutenant of the Tower, to bring him; it is Express'd that they did it, by *Leave and consent of his Majesty*. Here the *Lords* did not think fit, without the King's Express *Leave* and *Consent* first *Ask'd* and *Obtain'd*, to *Send* for, or *Examine*, upon the Head of a *Plot*, one of their own *Members*, and so more Intirely in their Power; And in the next place, one already *Condemned to Dye*, and so out of any *Protection* at all. *But to Return to our Speech.*

IX. In Paragr. 7. p. 3. He says, *In the end of King Charles II. Reign we all Remember that a new Prosecution of them ( the Dissenters ) was set on foot ; and even then, when the Severities against them were very hard, they were Solicited by the Agents of the Court, to Petition for a General Toleration, but they cou'd not be Prevail'd on.*

But there was a better Reason for their not *Petitioning*, that is, the Improbability of having it Granted. They had then been Palpably *Detect'd* in several *Conspiracies to Murther the King*, at the *Rye-House*, at the *Oxford Parliament*, &c. for which they were then under *Prosecution*, and some of them *Suffer'd* for it. Was this a *Time* were these good *Arguments to Sue for a Toleration*, when the King was not secure of his *Life* one Day, from

their Attempts ! And is it likely the *King* wou'd Employ *Agents* to Move them to *Ask*, what we must believe, in Common sence, he was Resolv'd not to *Grant* them ? But this is Another of this *Speecher's SECRETS.*

But the *Bishop* of *Sarum* wou'd not have Mention'd these *Severities* ( as they are call'd ) and said, that they were *very hard*, without telling the *Occasion* of them, and what *Forc'd* the *King* to them. Such an *Impratial Historian* wou'd not tell the Tale all on one side, to lay the *Odium* where it was not due.

And he wou'd not *Molifie* as much on the other hand, as is done in the next Words, *What some of them did in King James's Reign is well known, and cannot be Excused.* That is, in *Accepting* ( what they never Refus'd ) a *Toleration*, and their Mighty *Applauses*, and *Addresses* full of *Loyalty* upon that Occasion. But this is here put only upon *Some of them*, *What some of them did.* Whereas it was the whole *Body* or *Bodies* of them, all their *Meetings*, every where through *England*, as well as *Scotland* and *Ireland*. And if there were *Any* or *Some* who did not Approve it, they did not *Appear*, they were not *Known*. They must be put among the *Secrets* of this *Writer* !

X. The Learned *Bishop* of *Sarum* cou'd not Talk so Loosely of the *Church* and of *Communion* as this *Speech* do's, *Paragr.* 15, and 16. p. 6. where the *Writer* makes *Episcopacy* not to be *Necessary* to

to the *Constitution* of a *Church*, Contrary to the Bishop's *Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland*, against the *Presbyterians* there.

If *Episcopacy* is not *Necessary*, if it is not of *Divine* and *Apostolical Institution*, if it may be *Dispens'd* with, then *Down with it*. It is a *Bone of Contention*. And an *Infraction* among the *Reform'd*.

But whatever *Allowance* is to be made in Cases of *Necessity*, for those who cannot have *Episcopacy*, if any such there be. Yet it is not the same, with those who *Rebel* against *Episcopacy* and *Separate* from their own *Lawful Bishops*, where nothing *Sinful* is Requir'd as a *Condition of Communion*. If this be not *Schism*, there never was any. Nor can be. And the *Bishop of Sarum* is neither so *Ignorant* or *Enthusiastical* as to think that our *Dissenters* are not formaly *Schismaticks*; and therefore, that *Communion* with them is not utterly *Unlawful*, and Involving us in their *Schism*.

And as to the *Foreign Reformed*, we know that our Learned *Biskops* and *Divines* who were *Forc'd Abroad* in the former *Revolution*, did Refuse to *Communicate* with them. As Dr. Brambal, Lord *Bishop of Derry* after Lord *Primate of Ireland* Dr. Morley after Lord *Bishop of Winchester*, Dr. Creighton after *Bishop of Bath and Wells*, Dr. Earl after *Bishop of Salisbury*, Dr. Stuart, &c. And after the *Restoration*, by the *Act of Uniformity* their *Ordinations* were so far Declared *Null*, that if any

of their *Ministers* (as well as those among our selves) shou'd come over to our *Church*, they were Accounted but as *Lay-Men*, till they were *Ordain'd by Bishops.*

This matter was Debated by our *Divines* with the Reformed *Ministers Abroad*; who took it Heinously that they Refus'd *Communion* with them. There is in *Print* a Letter from the Learned and Ingenious Mr. *Bouchart*, to the then Dr. *Morley* before Mention'd, upon this Subject. But our *Divines* Asserted the *Divine Right and Necessity of Episcopacy and Ordination by Bishops.*

Now suppose that the *Bishop of Sarum* had a Greater *Latitude* than our *English Divines*, which ought not to be suppos'd, because he was a Strenuous *Afferter of Episcopacy*, and a *Writer* for it in *Scotland*, which he hath done Excellently well: But I say, That if he had Alter'd his Mind, his *Prudence* and his *Modesty* wou'd have found out some other *Argument*, than to Oppose his own *Example* and *Authority* to that of the *Divines* before Mention'd, and the Current of the *Church of England*, and not to give this for a *Proof* as this *Speech* makes him, saying, *I my self was an Occasional Conformist in Geneva and Holland.* And says he will do so again, when he go's thither next time. Thence concludes as a *certainty*, *And so I think an Occasional Conformity, &c. is Justify'd.*

To

To fortify his own Example, there is nothing brought in this *Speech*, but a Passage (which is not Quoted) of a *Noble Historian*, who, he says, finds great fault with those who did not go to the French Churches. Yet that *Noble Historian* did not go himself, tho' he Dy'd there. And there is yet in being a Discourse wrote with his own hand, which I have seen, shewing his Reasons why he cou'd not Communicate with them. And I am told by a good hand, when he was Sick at *Montpelier*, an *Apothecary* was sent for to him, who Pressing his Lordship to more than Ordinary hast to Dispatch him, gave for Excuse, that as soon as he had done with his Lordship, he was to lay on his Hands at an *Ordination* (he being a Lay-Elder) and that the Company staid for him. His Lordship was Struck with Astonishment, to see how Viley the *Holy Orders* were Prostituted. And us'd to say, can any Believe that the Character of a Minister of Christ is Convey'd by such Mechanicks? So that this was an unlucky Second found out for the *Bishop* upon this Point.

A Reverend and Worthy *Divine* told me, That about 30 years ago, Monsieur *Claude* the famous *Hugonot Minister*, did Inveigh bitterly to him against this same *Noble Historian*, as well as against Dr. *Morley*, and others of our *Divines* there, who Refus'd to Communicate with the *Hugonots* in *France*.

And as to that Passage in his Lordship's *History*, which I suppose is meant in this *Speech*. Vol. 2. p. 73. &c. his Lordship is there Discoursing purely upon *Politicks*; how useful it was to keep fair with those People, and what Services they had done us, as *Spies in the Courts* of their own *Princes*. But it seems they cou'd *Play* on both sides. For the *History* tells in the same place, p. 75. That when the *Rebellion* broke out against King *Charles I.* their *Malice* to the *Church* made them Enter into the *same Conspiracy* with their *Brethren* the *Presbyterians* here, against the *Crown*.

But the *Disciples of the Cross* (of which Number, as this *Speech* Truly says, the Bishop of *Sarum* is, in an Eminent degree, and never Vary'd from it, *in any one step*, through the *whole course of his Life*) do not Govern their *Consciences* by *Worldly Politicks*; But always make their *Politicks* wholly subservient to *Religion*. And no Man knows better than the *Bishop*, that the *Church* and *Religion* have Suffer'd more, and been more *Corrupted* in *Doctrine* and *Worship*, and lost the *Simplicity* of the *Gospel*, by following of these sort of *Politicks*, more than by all the open *Persecutions* which they have Endur'd.

The *Noble Historian* blames the *Unskilfulness* of our *Management* of the *Hugonots* in *France*; And thereupon Discourses as a *States-Man*. But as to the *Consciencious* part, he sufficiently Guarded, p. 72. before he Enter'd upon the other Subject

Subject of Politicks, and with which he Introduceth it, in a most Pious and Christian, as well as a Prudent and Political Discourse, against that too common Artifice of Princes, and States, to Foment Divisions and Rebellions in each others Countries. Which he Exposes, in a very Pathetical manner, not only as very Wicked before God, but Im-Politick as to Themselves, thereby Teaching their own Subjects to RebELL. He says, That the Rebellion of Subjects against their Prince, ought to be look'd upon by all other Kings, as an Assault of their own Sovereignty, and in some Degree, a Design against Monarchy it self; and consequently to be suppressed and Extirpated, in what other Kingdom soever it is, with the like concernment as if it were in their own Bowels. And he says, that the Hugonots in France (with whom this Crown heretofore, it may be, kept too much Correspondence) were declar'd Enemies to the King; and in Publick and in Secret, gave all possible Assistance to those whose Business was to Destroy the Church. And Prov'd of unspeakable Inconvenience and Damage to the King, throughout all these Troubles, and of equal Benefit to his Enemies. Having thus fully Declar'd his own Sentiments, with Great Probity and Judgment he goes on to shew the Mismanagements, as to Politicks, which happen'd in their Trafficking with these Hugonots. Among which was this, of withdrawing from their Communion, which is Aim'd at in this Speech.

But

But if the *Bishop* had been the *Author* of it, he wou'd, no Doubt, have done that *Justice* to the *Noble Historian*, as to have told his True and Real Sentiments, and not have Represented him as an *Occasional Conformist*, whom he knew to be far otherwise. And again, he wou'd not have brought an Argument of *Politicks*, for satisfying *Conscience*. That wou'd have come better from any other hand.

XI. Wherefore this *Speech* Acts the *Bishop* better, where it makes him give a Reason as to *Conscience*, Parag. 15. p. 6. *I thought Communion with them was Lawful, for their Worship was not Corrupted.* But then the *Bishop* cou'd not have given so very Weak a Reason. Because this takes away all *Separation*, on Account of *Schism*, where the *Worship* is not *Corrupted*. Against which the *Schism* of *Korah* stands a *Rul'd Case*. And St. *Jude* tells us, ver. 11. of *Christians* who *Perish* in that same *Gain saying*. And the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, in the Case of the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, and other *Schismatics*, who gave up their very *Lives* for the *Faith*, makes all against this. And sure the *Bishop* wou'd not Oppose his own single *Authority* against all these too.

Besides that, this Notion makes very Little of the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Church*, upon which *Christ* laid so great a *Stress*, as to call a Breach in it, the *Tearing* of his own *Body* in pieces. And all *Civil Societies* are so sensible of it, as to think it

it the Worst *Evil* can befall them, even the Dissolving of their *Constitution*. The same that *Dissord* is in a *Family*; that *Mutiny* is in an *Army*; and *Rebellion* in a *State*; the same is *Schism* in a *Church*. And none take it more *Heinously* than *Schismatical Congreations*, when it happens amongst themselves. And the *Less* the *Causes* are for which Men *Separate*, their *Schism* is Reckon'd the *Greater* and more *Un-Excusable*.

And there is no End of the Consequences. When the *Presbyterians* took upon them to *Ordain* without *Bishops*, the *Independants* Quickly found the way to *Ordain* without *Presbyters*, and others after them, to set up *Ministers* of *Christ* (as they call them) without any *Ordination* at all. And as a Natural Consequence of this, to bring all *Priestly Administrations* into utter *Contempt*, and to be *Perform'd* by a *Woman*, as well as a *Man*, even the *Administration* of the *Holy Sacrament*, which is made but the *Remembrance* of a *Friend*, like *Drinking* of a *Health*, which may be *Begun* by any in the *Company*, by a *Woman* as well as any other. All this is set up in our late *Pamphlets*, I will Name one, which has been often *Advertis'd* in our *Printed-News-Papers*, call'd *The Principles of the Protestant Reformation Explain'd, in a Letter of Resolution concerning Church-Communion.* London, Printed in the Year 1704. where p. 10, 11. You will find what is above Mention'd.

This of *She-Apostles* and *Priests* did a little *Shock* Serjeant *Hook*. But otherwise, as to that of Over-thowing all Stated *Church-Communion* and *Government*, the Serjeant Learned in the *Law*, go's ful-ly in with that *Author*, and Quotes this very *Book* of his with Approbation, in what the Serjeant calls *Catholicism without Popery*. Part. 2. p. 57. Printed, 1704. And often *Advertis'd*.

All these Pamphlets are Wrote in behalf of *Oc-  
casional Conformity*. And the way to Salve it, is, by making no *Communion* necessary. And then soon follows no *Church*, and no *Religion*! Can the like be said of any who *Wrote* for the *Bill*?

Therefore we see the *Necessity* of keeping up *Episcopacy*. To allow of other *Ordinations* without *Bishops*, is Breaking the *Dike*, which will let all this *Inundation* in upon us.

If *Christians* liv'd together where no *Episcopal Ordination* cou'd be had, they Might and Ought to Meet and serve God, in a *Publick Manner*, as far as their *Circumstances* wou'd Allow it. This is *Lay-Communion*. And God wou'd not Charge upon them the want of the Holy *Sacraments*, or other things which they cou'd not have without *Priestly Administration*. And to bear with the want of these, under such an Invincible Necessity, is more of *Humility* and *Reverence* to God and his *Laws*; than to take upon us, of our own Heads, and without any *Commission* from him, to *Consecrate Priests* our selves. Which Honour no Man taketh to him-

himself. And none can give it but God. None other can Impower any to *Represent* him, to *Transact* with Mankind in his *Name*; and to *Sign* and *Seal* his *Covenant* with them. Thus the *Jews* all over the World have Rightly Determin'd rather to have no *Sacrifices* at all, than not at the *Place* to which they were Limited by the *Law*. Which place *Jerusalem* being not in their Power, and their *Temple* Destroy'd, they Inferr, That it is the will of God their *Sacrifices* shou'd Cease, till they are *Restor'd* again. But that they cannot make a New *Law*, or observe the *Law* given them otherwise than as that *Law* has Commanded. The Example of *Uzzah* is a Rule to us, as well as to them, that God will not Accept the *Breach* of his *Institution*, tho' with an *Intention* of *Preserving* it. But the want of his *Ordinances* will not be Imputed where there is not a *Possibility* of having them. The *Breach* of his *Institution*, is *Our Act*: But the being Depriv'd of the Benefit of his *Ordinances*, if it be not our *Fault*, will not be our *Crime*. If we must not set up other *Sacraments* ( Supposing us Depriv'd of the True ones, which *Christ* left us ) neither must we Another *Priesthood*. It is *Usurping* the *Prerogative* of God to our selves. And Rendring our whole Service *Sacrilegious*, like the *Offerings* of *Korah*. It is the *Iniquity* of our *Holy* things.

XII. Which it were to be wish'd was so much Abated as this *Speech* tells us, p. 3. Paragr. 8. At least a Fourth part, if not a Third part. For so

much it says the *Dissenters* are *Lessen'd* since the *Toleration*. But how do's this Appear? For their *Meetings* are so much at least, *Encreased* every where. And their *Party* is grown *Stronger*, at *Court*, in *Parliament*, and at all *Elections*. And they never were so *Clamorous* and *Threatning* as now. One chief *Topick* of their *Pamphlets* is to *Boast* and *Terrifie* with their *Numbers*, and say they are the *Major* part of the *Nation*. Which is as little True, as that their *Numbers* are *Lessen'd* by the *Toleration*.

But if this Latter were True, how do's it concern the *Bill*, which do's not Meddle with their *Toleration*? Will being put into *Power* lessen their *Numbers* too!

Therefore it was most unbecoming his Lordship to make him say in this *Speech*, p. 7. Paragr. 17. *In my Diocese, those who are Occasional Conformists out of Principle, who come sometimes to Church, and go sometimes to Meetings, are without Number; who yet have no Office, and seem to Pretend to none.* If they do not only *Seem* so to *Pretend*, this *Bill* do's not Affect them in the least. and the *Church* may Reap all the Benefit propos'd in this *Speech*, by their *Occasional Conformity*. So that this woud be to make his Lordship argue quite besides the Point. Especially where he is made to say, in the same *Paragr.* *I have heard but of One in Office in my Diocese, who goes to Meetings; and that is only to a Weekly Lecture.* Then the Danger of Disobliging is not Great. It is but *One*

*One to without Number.* This is still Arguing for the *Bill*. And the *Occasional Conformists* out of *Principle* do likewise Seem to be much offended at those who do it for *Places*, as bringing the *Scandal of Hypocrisy* upon them all, and have Wrote against such *Occasional Conformity* To these *without Number*, we must add those in the Interest of the *Church*, who generally through the Kingdom are much *Disgusted* at the *Rejection* of this *Bill*. And by the *Computation* here put upon the *Bishop* in his own *Dioceſſ*, and Supposing it alike in all the other *Dioceſſes* of the *Nation*, there will be but *One in Each*, that is 26 in all, who are *Gratify'd* by the ill *Fate* of that *Bill*. And these Men are of no *Principle*, and a *Scandal* to *Religion*, as they are call'd in that Celebrated *Book* wrote on their side, viz. *Moderation a Virtue*. p. 7. where it is said, *I take such Occasional Conformity, to be a Scandalous Practise, a Reproach to Religion, and Offensive to all good Christians.*

But if those *without Number* in his Lordship's *Dioceſſ*, who go sometimes to *Church*, and sometimes to *Meetings*, are Brought up in that *Loose* way, of thinking that there is nothing of *Govern-ment* left by *Christ* in his *Church*, nor a *Succession* of *Priesthood*, with Power of *Remitting* and *Retaining Sins*, of *Consecrating* and *Adminiſtring* his *Sacraments*, and *Blessing* in his *Name*: Or that this may be *Conferr'd*, by any 3 or 4 *Lay-Men* or *Women*; that is, who Consider the *Church* as a *Seſt*

only, or Company of *People* who *Believe* such *Doctrines*, as the severai sorts of the Heathen *Philosophers*, *Stoicks*, *Academicks*, *Epicureans*, &c. which a Man might *Change* every *Hour* of the *Day*, without being *Accountable* to any ; But cou'd not be *Excluded* or *Excommunicated* from being of such an *Opinion* ; and might Appoint whom he Pleas'd to Read *Lectures* to him, or *Preach*, upon such and such *Subje&ts* : But have no Notion of the *Church*, as a *Society*, under *Government*, with such *Powers* Committed to the *Governors*, of *Admitting* and *Exclud-ing* out of the *Society*, and the *Privileges* of it ; and pursuant to such a Notion, are Free to go to any *Company*, of *People*, where they think *Christi-an* *Doctrine* is Taught ; and think themselves Equally *Safe* in any ; and therefore, go sometimes to *Church*, and sometimes to *Meetings*, as the *Hu-mour* leads them, or they *Fancy* they are *Edify'd* : I say, if there be *Numberless* of this sort in the *Di-oce&ss* of *Sarum* (which God forbid) there is a sad Account of his Lordship's *Charge* : And instead of being of this or that *Church*, they are in no *Church* at all, if *Christ* did Erect his *Church* as a *Society*.

There are too Many of such *Occasional Confor-mists* in *England*. I shou'd be sorry, if it were True, that they Increase so Exceedingly under the Direction of my Lord *Bishop* of *Sarum*. It is Impossible to be by his *Encouragement* ! Who in this same *Speech* (if it were his) Paragr. 16. p. 6. says, *That the Separation is form'd upon Error and Mistake*,

*Mistake, and that true Edification is among us, and not among them, and that They are certainly to Blame, in every part of the Separation.* No High-Flyer in *England* cou'd say more. And is it Possible he cou'd Encourage any to Go to Them, or Remain among Them, where no *True Edification* was to be had ! And who were to *Blame*, in *every Part* of their *Separation* ! Then such thorough *Blameable Separation* must be a *Schism*, or there Can be None !

Therefore, whoever Believes this *Speech* to be the *Bishop* of *Sarum's*, must Conclude, That he thinks all the *Separatists* of the *Nation* from the *Church of England*, to be In-excusable *Schismatics*.

XIII. But there is a *Caveat* put in at the Close of the *Speech*, for some others, *Nor can I consent* (says *Speech*) *to the Reckoning the Foreign Churches that are Tolerated among Us, which are by Name Excepted in the Act of Uniformity, among the Meetings of the Separatists from our Church.*

If they have *Meetings* of their own, on Account of the *Language*, and this be Allow'd, there is no Harm done. But if they Refuse to *Communicate* with Us, because we are *Episcopal* (which I suppose they do not) they wou'd then be *Schismatics* from the whole *Catholick Church*. For by the Rules of *Catholick Communion*, every *National* or *Neighbour Church* ought to *Communicate* with Another, where there are no sinful *Terms* of *Communion*

*munion Impos'd, or else, they Break the Communion of Saints.*

But what Reason is Given in this Speech? Why thus, in the next words, *This will have a strange sound all the World over; and will be a mighty Discouragement to all Abroad, who Expect Deliverance and Protection from hence; when they understand that it is made so Criminal a thing among Us to Worship God with them, and according to their way.* And is this all the Reason given? Yes, every word.

Then this Cou'd not Come from any *Bishop*. What *Bishop* or *Christian* were he, who upon the Point of *Church Communion*, shou'd have nothing to offer, but a Parcel of poor *Politicks*! And these *Foolish* too! For do's not the *Emperour*, the *King of Portugal*, the *New King of Spain*, and the *Duke of Savoy* Expect Deliverance and Protection from *Hence*, and may be the *King of Poland* too, as well as *Holland*? What Discouragement then will it be to the one more than to the other, that we Cannot *Worship God with them, and according to their way*? Or, are the *Dutch* more Zealous than all the others, upon the Point of *Religion*? Are They Turn'd *High-Church-Men* too!

XIV. But whatever *Latitude* or *Indifferency* they may have as to *Religion* or *Conscience*; And however they may Dispeuse with *Occasional Conformity*, upon these Accounts, which lie not near their *Hearts*: Yet they know full well how to secure their *Government*, and their *Church*, *Establish'd by Law*.

*Law*; which they suffer none to *Invaide* or *Infalt*, as Ours is every Day, in *Lew'd* and *Virulent Pamphlets*. Much less for any of the *Tolerated Communities* there, to set up for the true *Church* of the *Nation*; As several of our *Dissenting Pamphlets* here have done, Asserting the *Dissenters* to be true *Church* of *England*; And, on Account of their *Toleration*, to be like wise *Establish'd by Law*; so that *Dan. Burges* has as much *Law* on his side, as the *Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*.

However, because there is some Difference betwixt being *Establish'd* and *Tolerated*, the *Dissenters* have, of late, had a Great Aversion to that Phrase, of the *Church*, as *Establish'd by Law*. And this *Speech* does Gratifie them in it, Parag. 11. p. 5. it makes the *Bishop* say, *I have been Jealous when I heard some Persons pretend too much Zeal for the Church of England, as by Law Establish'd*. There is a Reason given, to serve for a Pretence, as if this were Meant only against the *Papists*. But it is so Foolish, as to Pass upon no Man of Common Sense. It is thus, *I knew one of the Eminentest Papists of the Age, who us'd often to say, he was for the Church of England, as by Law Establish'd: I took the Liberty to Ask him, How such a Profession did Agree with his Sincerity? He answer'd, He look'd on the Laws of Queen Mary as yet in full force; for he thought Q. Elizabeth who Repeal'd them, had no more Right to the Crown, than Oliver Cromwel had; so that her Laws, were no Laws.* But did that *Eminentest Papist* think That K. James I. K. Charles I. and K. Charles II. had no more Right to the *Crown* than *Oliver Cromwel*? Or, did he not know, That there were *Laws* in these *Reigns* which did *Establish* the *Church of England*? So that this is a very simple Story; and wholly Unworthy the *Bishop* of *Sachsenburg*

*lisbury.* But the Drift of the *Speech* is Plain, to Run down that Discrimination of the *Church of England*, as by Law Establish'd, to give the *Dissenters* an Equal Title to it.

And therefore no Man can believe, That the *Bishop* of *Sarum* wou'd set up such Doctrine; who says, in the very next *Parag.* (as set down in this *Speech*) of himself, and the Rest of his *Bench*, *We have in the whole course of our Lives adhered to the Interest of the Church, at all Perils, and in all Times, without ever once, in any particular, leaning to the Dissenters.* Wou'd any make us believe, That he did not mean the *Church*, as by Law Establish'd? Or, That he wou'd be *Jealous* of those who were *Zealous* for her? And that we must be put hereafter to Guess what he means when he speaks of the *Church*, or of the *Church of England*? Can the *Bishop* of *Sarum* have such a *Double Entendre*!

XV. But after all that can be said on behalf of the *Bishop*, the *Finishing-stroke* must be left to Himself. He only can Effectually *Silence* all this *Clamour* and *Scandal* Cast upon him, on Account of this *Speech*, by letting the World know, That his Lordship do's *Dismiss* it. After which, no one will have the Confidence to Put it upon him.

And *Ri. Chiswell* his Lordship's *Bookseller*, for whom it is said to be *Printed*, ought to do that Justice to his Lordship, as to give an *Advertisement*, that his *Name* was Falsely put to it, or that he had not the *Copy* from his *Lordship*.

F I N I S.

390/12/39

E R R A T A.

P<sup>age</sup> 6. l. 18. f. having, r. have. p. 23. l. 5. f. Men, r. more. l. 12. f. True, r. Free. p. 30. l. 6. f. High-Alies, r. High-Fliers. p. 31. l. 9. f. Abjuration, r. Adjuration. p. 35. l. 17. r. his own. p. 49. l. 6. r. Congregations.







